- 5 -

REMARKS.

The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on September 19, 2007.

Response to Arguments

The examiner kindly provides a detailed response to applicant's arguments, stating, among other points, that applicant does not specify in either the disclosure or the claims what the applicant means by juncture. The applicant urges the examiner to consider, as he has not yet done, claims other than the broadest claim. Claim 53 recites "wherein the juncture comprises a MacPherson strut dome in a vehicle body assembly." Claim 54 recites "wherein the juncture comprises a vehicle roof and a roof bow in a vehicle body assembly." Claim 55 recites "wherein the juncture comprises aligned openings in two metal parts joined by a peg or other rigid connective element." Moreover all the drawings in applicant's application, being a part of the disclosure, and the text description of those drawings specify the nature of what applicant means by "juncture" and what applicant means by "shaped to conform".

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

6. Claims 56-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cleslik (EP 0 453 777 A2)

Applicant's Response

The examiner has interpreted applicant's language in the broadest possible way, evidently without too much regard to the meaning of the terms of the claims as defined in applicant's specification.

Accordingly the applicant has amended claim 50 to recite:

- 50. A method for providing corrosion protection in an assembly of two or more metal parts, comprising the steps of:
- (a) given two metal parts to be joined, but not yet joined, placing a corrosion protection element comprising heat-expandable material proximate one of the parts to be joined;
- (b) joining the two parts in a manner that the corrosion-protection element is positioned between the two metal parts; and
- (c) expanding the corrosion-protection element at another point in the assembly process by application of heat.

It is abundantly clear, and pointed out previously, that Cleslik uses an expandable material to fill a void in parts already joined. In Cleslik the juncture, as understood and applied by the examiner, and circled in the copy of Cleslik's Fig. 2 provided in the action, is already joined, with the metal parts in contact, before the heat-expandable element is introduced. The metal parts in contact is part of the basis of the corrosion problem sought to be eliminated by the present invention. So the specification in claim 50, as amended, that the element is placed before the parts are joined, and positioned such that the element is between the parts, distinguishes rather nicely over Cleslik, and the form of the element as a limitation is no longer needed.

Claim 51-8, depended from claim 50 either directly or indirectly, are now patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 59 as last amended recites:

59. (Previously presented) A corrosion-protection element comprising a portion of heat-expandable material shaped to conform, prior to expansion, to a general shape of a

-7-

juncture between two or more metal parts of an assembly, to fill the juncture when later expanded by heat.

Clesliks element is NOT shaped to conform to the shape of a juncture of elements prior to expansion. It is in the act of expansion that Cleslik's element fills the void as shown in Fig. 2 as provided by the examiner, not before.

Claim 59 is therefore patentable over Cleslik, and claims 60-67 are patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 68 is cancelled.

As all of the claims standing for examination have been shown clearly to be patentable over the art cited and applied, taken either singly or in combination, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the case be passed quickly to issue.

If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted, Reinhard List

By [Donald R. Boys]
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc. 3 Hangar Way, Suite D Watsonville, CA 95076 831-768-1755

Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121)

8317688550

Application No. 10/534,641

Applicant(s)
LIST, REINHARD

Art Unit 1700

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

The amendment document filed on 31 October, 2007 is considered non-compliant because it has failed to meet the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121 or 1.4. In order for the amendment document to be compliant, correction of the following item(s) is required.

ж	em(s) is required.		•
T	A. Amended pa	(X) ITEM(S) CAUSE THE AMENDMENT DC e specification: aragraph(s) do not include markings. aph(s) should not be underlined.	OCUMENT TO BE NON-COMPLIANT:
	2. Abstract: A. Not presente B. Other	ed on a separate sheet. 37 CFR 1.72,	
	B. The practice	s are not properly identified in the top margir Sheet" as required by 37 CFR 1.121(d)	as been eliminated. Replacement drowless
	☐ B. The listing of ☐ C. Each claim had seen claim had seen claim number by us (Previously p	sting of all of the claims is not present. claims does not include the text of all pending as not been provided with the proper status of cannot be identified. Note: the status of existing one of the following status identifiers: (Our exerted), (New), (Not entered), (Withdrawn of this amendment paper have not been presented).	identifier, and as such, the individual status very claim must be indicated after its claim Original), (Currently amended), (Canceled), and (Withdrawn-currently amended)
	5. Other (e.g., the ame of the amendment format r	endment is unsigned or not signed in accorda required by 37 CFR 1.121, see MPEP § 714	ance with 37 CFR 1.4): For further explanation
TIN 1.	mod ditor diluwance, or a or	REPLY TO THIS NOTICE: ime period if the non-compliant amendmen rawing submission (only) If applicant wishes s, the entire corrected amendment must b	t is an after-final amendment or an amendment to resubmit the non-compliant after-final e resubmitted.
2.	Applicant is given one month, or thirty (30) days, whichever is longer, from the mail date of this notice to supply the correction, if the non-compliant amendment is one of the following: a preliminary amendment, a non-final amendment (including a submission for a request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114), a supplemental amendment filed within a suspension period under 37 CFR 1.103(a) or (c), and an amendment filed in response to a Quayle action. If any of above boxes 1 to 4 are checked, the correction required is only the corrected section of the non-compliant amendment in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121.		
-	Failure to timely respon Abandonment of the		is a non-final amendment or an amendment
Loo		ndment if the non-compliant amendment is a	preliminary amendment or supplemental
		E), if applicable Felicia Allen-Jenkins	Telephone No: 571-272-0686
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-324 (04-06)		Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 C	Part of Paper No. 2007110
			00

GE 11

Continuation of 4. Other: claim 55 status identifier is incorrect because there are no markings...

